arXiv:1404.5161v1 [math.NT] 21 Apr 2014

# A QUANTITATIVE RESULT ON DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION FOR INTERSECTIVE POLYNOMIALS

NEIL LYALL ALEX RICE

Abstract. In this short note, we closely follow the approach of Green and Tao [3] to extend the best known bound for recurrence modulo 1 from squares to the largest possible class of polynomials. The paper concludes with a brief discussion of a consequence of this result for polynomials structures in sumsets and limitations of the method.

## 1. Introduction

We begin by recalling the well-known Kronecker approximation theorem:

**Theorem A** (Kronecker Approximation Theorem)**.** *Given $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq N$ such that*

$$\|n\alpha_j\| \ll N^{-1/d} \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

*Remark on Notation:* In Theorem A above, and in the rest of this paper, we use the standard notations $\|\alpha\|$ to denote, for a given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the distance from $\alpha$ to the nearest integer and the Vinogradov symbol $\ll$ to denote "less than a constant times".

Kronecker's theorem is of course an almost immediate consequence of the pigeonhole principle: one simply partitions the torus $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ into $N$ "boxes" of side length at most $2N^{-1/d}$ and considers the orbit of $(n\alpha_1, \dots, n\alpha_d)$. In [3], Green and Tao presented a proof of the following quadratic analogue of the above theorem, due to Schmidt [9].

**Theorem B** (Simultaneous Quadratic Recurrence, Proposition A.2 in [3])**.** *Given $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq N$ such that*

$$\|n^2\alpha_j\| \ll dN^{-c/d^2} \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

The argument presented by Green and Tao in [3] was later extended (in a straightforward manner) by the second author and Magyar in [6] to any system of polynomials without constant term.

**Theorem C** (Simultaneous Polynomial Recurrence, consequence of Proposition B.2 in [6])**.** *Given any system of polynomials $h_1, \dots, h_d$ of degree at most $k$ with real coefficients and no constant term and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $1 \leq n \leq N$ such that*

$$\|h_j(n)\| \ll k^2 dN^{-ck^{-C}/d^2} \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq j \leq d,$$

*where $C, c > 0$ and the implied constant are absolute.*

Such a recurrence result does not hold for every polynomial. Specifically, if $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ has no root modulo $q$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\|h(n)/q\| \geq 1/q$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, a local obstruction which leads to the following definition.

**Definition 1.** We say that $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is *intersective* if for every $q \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $q \mid h(r)$. Equivalently, $h$ is intersective if it has a root in the $p$-adic integers for every prime $p$.

Intersective polynomials include all polynomials with an integer root, but also include certain polynomials without rational roots, such as $(x^3 - 19)(x^2 + x + 1)$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11B30.

## 2. Recurrence for Intersective Polynomials

The purpose of this note is to extend the argument of Green and Tao [3] to establish the following quantitative improvement of a result of Lê and Spencer [4].

**Theorem 1.** *Given $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$, an intersective polynomial $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree $k$, and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $1 \le n \le N$ with $h(n) \neq 0$ and*

$$\|h(n)\alpha_j\| \ll dN^{-c^k/d^2} \text{ for all } 1 \le j \le d,$$

*where $c > 0$ is absolute and the the implied constant depends only on $h$.*

In [4], the right hand side is replaced with $N^{-\theta}$ for some $\theta = \theta(k, d) > 0$. Here we follow Green and Tao's [3] refinement of Schmidt's [9] lattice method nearly verbatim, beginning with the following definitions.

**Definition 2.** Suppose that $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a full-rank lattice. For any $t > 0$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the *theta function*

$$\Theta_\Lambda(t, x) := \sum_{m \in \Lambda} e^{-\pi t|x-m|^2}.$$

Further, we define

$$A_\Lambda := \Theta_{\Lambda^*}(1, 0) = \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda^*} e^{-\pi|\xi|^2} = \det(\Lambda) \sum_{m \in \Lambda} e^{-\pi|m|^2},$$

where $\Lambda^* = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \ : \xi \cdot m \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } m \in \Lambda\}$ and the last equality follows from the Poisson summation formula. Finally, for a polynomial $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $N > 0$, we define

$$F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) := \det(\Lambda)\mathbb{E}_{1 \le n \le N}\Theta_\Lambda(1, h(n)\alpha).$$

For the remainder of the discussion, we fix an intersective polynomial $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree $k$, and we let $K = 2^{10k}$. We use $C$ and $c$ to denote sufficiently large and small absolute constants, respectively, and we allow any implied constants to depend on $h$. By definition $h$ has a root at every modulus, but we need to fix a particular root at each modulus in a consistent way, which we accomplish below.

**Definition 3.** For each prime $p$, we fix $p$-adic integers $z_p$ with $h(z_p) = 0$. By reducing and applying the Chinese Remainder Theorem, the choices of $z_p$ determine, for each natural number $q$, a unique integer $r_q \in (-q, 0]$, which consequently satisfies $q \mid h(r_q)$. We define the function $\lambda$ on $\mathbb{N}$ by letting $\lambda(p) = p^m$ for each prime $p$, where $m$ is the multiplicity of $z_p$ as a root of $h$, and then extending it to be completely multiplicative.

For each $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the *auxiliary polynomial*, $h_q$, by

$$h_q(x) = h(r_q + qx)/\lambda(q),$$

noting that each auxiliary polynomial maintains integral coefficients.

As in [3], we make use of the following properties of $F$, only one of which needs to be tangibly modified due to the presence of a general intersective polynomial.

**Lemma 1** (Properties of $F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}$)**.** *If $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $q, N \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

(i) (Contraction of $N$) $F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg cF_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(cN)$ *for any* $c \in (10/N, 1)$.
(ii) (Dilation of $\alpha$) $F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg \frac{1}{q'}F_{h_{qq'},\Lambda,\lambda(q')\alpha}(N/q')$ *for any* $q' \le N/10$.
(iii) (Stability) *If* $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *with* $|\alpha - \tilde{\alpha}| < \epsilon/\max_{1 \le n \le N} |h_q(n)|$ *and* $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, *then*

$$F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg F_{h_q,(1+\epsilon)\Lambda,(1+\epsilon)\tilde{\alpha}}(N).$$

*Proof.* Property (i) follows immediately from the definition of $F$ and the positivity of $\Theta$, and property (iii) is exactly as in Lemma A.5 in [3]. For property (ii), by positivity of $\Theta$, complete multiplicativity of $\lambda$, and the fact that $r_q \equiv r_{qq'} \bmod qq'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) &= \det(\Lambda)\mathbb{E}_{\substack{r_q+q\le n\le r_q+qN \\ n\equiv r_q \bmod q}}(1, h(n)\alpha/\lambda(q)) \\ &\ge \det(\Lambda)\mathbb{E}_{\substack{r_q+q\le n\le r_q+qN \\ n\equiv r_{qq'} \bmod qq'}}(1, h(n)\alpha/\lambda(q)) \\ &\gg \frac{1}{q'}\det(\Lambda)\mathbb{E}_{1\le n\le N/q'}\Theta_\Lambda\Big(1, \frac{h(r_{qq'}+qq'n)}{\lambda(qq')}\lambda(q')\alpha\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{q'}F_{h_{qq'},\Lambda,\lambda(q')\alpha}(N/q'), \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

The key to the argument is the following "alternative lemma."

**Lemma 2** (Schmidt's Alternative)**.** *If $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a full-rank lattice, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $q \le N^{1/K}$, then one of the following holds:*

(i) $F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \ge 1/2$

(ii) *There exists $q' \ll dA_\Lambda^{Ck}$ and a primitive $\xi \in \Lambda^* \setminus \{0\}$ such that*

$$|\xi| \ll \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log A_\Lambda}$$

*and*

$$\|q'\xi \cdot \alpha\| \ll A_\Lambda^{Ck} N^{-k}.$$

The proof of Lemma 2 is identical to that of the corresponding lemma in [3], once armed with the following result, which follows from Weyl's Inequality and observations of Lucier [5] on auxiliary polynomials.

**Lemma 3.** *If $\delta \in (0,1)$, $q \le N^{1/K}$, and $|\mathbb{E}_{1\le n\le N}\ e^{2\pi i h_q(n)\theta}| \ge \delta$, then there exists $q' \ll \delta^{-k}$ such that $\|q'\theta\| \ll (\delta N)^{-k}$.*

Additionally, a proof of Lemma 3 is contained in Section 6.4 of [7]. Precisely as in [3], the alternative lemma gives the following inductive lower bound on $F$.

**Corollary 1** (Inductive lower bound on $F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}$)**.** *If $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a full-rank lattice, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $N > (dA_\Lambda)^{C_0 k}$ for a suitably large absolute constant $C_0$, and $q < N^{1/K}$, then one of the following holds:*

(i) $F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \ge 1/2$

(ii) *There exists $\alpha' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, a full-rank lattice $\Lambda' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, $N' \gg (dA_\Lambda)^{-Ck}N$, and $q' \ll (dA_\Lambda)^{Ck}$ with*

$$A_{\Lambda'} \ll (\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log A_\Lambda})A_\Lambda \tag{1}$$

*and*

$$F_{h_q,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg (dA_\Lambda)^{-Ck}F_{h_{qq'},\Lambda',\alpha'}(N'). \tag{2}$$

Finally, we use Corollary 1 to obtain a lower bound on $F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}$ that is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.

**Corollary 2.** *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a full-rank lattice with $\det(\Lambda) \geq 1$, and $N > (dA_\Lambda)^{C_1 kKd}$ for a suitably large absolute constant $C_1$, then*

$$F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg (dA_\Lambda)^{-Ckd}.$$

*Proof.* Setting $\alpha_0 = \alpha$, $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$, and $N_0 = N$, we repeatedly apply Corollary 1, obtaining vectors $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d-j}$, lattices $\Lambda_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-j}$, and integers $q_j, N_j$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots$. Assuming that $N_j > (dA_{\Lambda_j})^{C_0 k}$ and $q_j \leq N_j^{1/K}$ throughout the iteration, which we will show to be the case shortly, we must either pass through case *(i)* of Proposition 1 at some point, or the iteration continues all the way to dimension 0. The worst bounds come from the latter scenario, and we note that $F_{h_{q_d},\Lambda_d,\alpha_d}(N_d) = 1$. Using (1) and the crude inequality $\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{\log X} \ll dX^{1/d}$, we see that $A_{\Lambda_j} \ll A_{\Lambda_0}^C$ throughout the iteration. Since $N_{j+1} \geq (dA_{\Lambda_j})^{-Ck} N_j$ and $q_{j+1} \ll (dA_{\Lambda_j})^{Ck} q_j$, we see that $N_j > (dA_{\Lambda_j})^{C_0 k}$ and $q_j \leq N_j^{1/K}$ throughout, provided $N \geq (dA_\Lambda)^{C_1 kKd}$ for suitably large $C_1$. From (2), the result follows. □

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.** Fix real numbers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ and an intersective polynomial $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree $k$. Let $R$ be a quantity to be chosen later, and apply Corollary 2 with $\alpha = (R\alpha_1, \ldots, R\alpha_d)$ and $\Lambda = R\mathbb{Z}^d$. By definition we have

$$A_\Lambda = R^d \Big( \sum_{m \in R\mathbb{Z}} e^{-\pi m^2} \Big) \leq (CR)^d,$$

so if $R \geq C_2 d$ and $N > C_2 R^{C_2 kKd^2}$ for suitably large $C_2$, Corollary 2 implies

$$F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}(N) \gg R^{-Ckd^2}.$$

Since $\det(\Lambda) = R^d$, it follows from the definition of $F_{h,\Lambda,\alpha}$ that

$$\mathbb{E}_{1 \leq n \leq N} \sum_{m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\pi |h(n)\alpha - m|^2} \gg R^{-Ckd^2}$$

The contribution from all $n$ with $h(n) = 0$ is $\ll (CR)^d/N$, which is negligible if $N > C_2 R^{C_2 kKd^2}$. In this case we conclude that there exists $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ with $h(n) \neq 0$ and

$$\sum_{m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\pi |h(n)\alpha - m|^2} \gg R^{-Ckd^2} \tag{3}$$

Fixing such an $n$, if we had $|h(n)\alpha - m| > \sqrt{R}$ for all $m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d$, then we would have

$$e^{-\pi |h(n)\alpha - m|^2} \leq e^{-\pi R^2/2} e^{-\pi |h(n)\alpha - m|^2/2} \tag{4}$$

for all $m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d$. By the Poisson summation formula, we have the identity

$$\sum_{m \in \Lambda} e^{-\pi t |h(n)\alpha - m|^2} = \frac{1}{t^{d/2} \det(\Lambda)} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda^*} e^{-\pi |\xi|^2/t} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot h(n)\alpha}. \tag{5}$$

Applying (4) and (5), we conclude that

$$\sum_{m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\pi |h(n)\alpha - m|^2} \leq e^{-\pi R^2/2} \frac{2^{d/2}}{\det(\Lambda)} \sum_{\xi \in \Lambda^*} e^{-2\pi |\xi|^2} e^{2\pi i \xi \cdot h(n)\alpha} \leq e^{-\pi R^2/2} 2^{d/2} \frac{A_\Lambda}{\det(\Lambda)},$$

which is $\ll e^{-\pi R^2/2} (CR)^d$, which contradicts (3) if $R > C_2 d$. Therefore, under this assumption on $R$, it must be the case that there exists $m \in R\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $|h(n)\alpha - m| \leq \sqrt{R}$, which clearly implies that $\|h(n)\alpha_i\| \leq 1/\sqrt{R}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d$.

If $N \geq C_3 d^{C_3 kKd^2}$ for suitably large $C_3$, then the theorem follows by choosing $R = d^{-1} N^{c/d^2 kK}$ for a sufficiently small absolute constant $c > 0$. If instead $N < C_3 d^{C_3 kKd^2}$, then the theorem is trivial. □

## 3. Consequences and Limitations

3.1. **Consequences for sumsets following Croot-Laba-Sisask.** Croot, Laba, and Sisask [1] displayed, using machinery from [2] and [8], that for sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ of small doubling, there exists a low rank, large radius Bohr set $T$ with the property that a shift of any (not too large) subset of $T$ is contained in the sumset $A+B = \{a+b : a \in A, b \in B\}$. The theorems discussed in this paper imply the existence of particular polynomial configurations in Bohr sets, and hence can be incorporated with the techniques found in [1] to establish corresponding sumset results. Specifically, by replacing the Kronecker Approximation Theorem with Theorem 1 and C, respectively, in the proof of Theorem 1.4 in [1], one obtains the following results.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose $h \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is an intersective polynomial of degree $k$, and $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$|A+B| \leq K_A|A|, K_B|B|,$$

*then $A+B$ contains an arithmetic progression*

$$\{x + h(n)\ell : 1 \leq \ell \leq L\}$$

*with $x, \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h(n) \neq 0$ and*

$$L \gg \exp\Big(c^k\Big(\frac{\log|A+B|}{K_B^2(\log 2K_A)^6}\Big)^{1/3} - C\log(K_A \log|A|)\Big),$$

*where $C, c > 0$ are absolute constants, and the implied constant depends only on $h$.*

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose $h_1, \dots, h_m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $h_i(0) = 0$ and $\deg(h_i) \leq k$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, and $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$|A+B| \leq K_A|A|, K_B|B|,$$

*then $A+B$ contains a configuration of the form*

$$\{x + h_i(n)\ell : 1 \leq i \leq m,\ 1 \leq \ell \leq L\}$$

*with $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_i(n) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and*

$$L \gg \exp\Big(ck^{-C}\Big(\frac{\log|A+B|}{m^2K_B^2(\log 2K_A)^6}\Big)^{1/3} - C\log(mkK_A \log|A|)\Big),$$

*where $C, c > 0$ and the implied constant are absolute.*

Noting that if $A, B \subseteq [1, N]$ with $|A| = \alpha N$ and $|B| = \beta N$, then one can take $K_A = 2\alpha^{-1}$ and $K_B = 2\beta^{-1}$, yielding special cases of Theorems 2 and 3 phrased in terms of densities.

3.2. **Limitations toward simultaneous recurrence.** Upon inspection of Theorems C and 1, and correspondingly Theorems 2 and 3, the natural question arises of the possibility of common refinements. Specifically, if $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h_1, \cdots, h_m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is a *jointly intersective* collection of polynomials, meaning the polynomials share a common root at each modulus, can one simultaneously control $\|h_i(n)\alpha_j\|$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$? In a qualitative sense, Lê and Spencer [4] answered this question in the affirmative, but in this context obstructions arise to the application of the methods found in [6] to establish a bound such as that found in Theorem 1.

For example, suppose $h_1(x) = b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2$ and $h_2(x) = c_0 + c_1x + c_3x^3$. This system of polynomials is a "nice" system as defined in [4], but to apply the methods of [6] it is necessary to firmly control Gauss sums of the form

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{2\pi i(h_1(n)a_1 + h_2(n)a_2)/q} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{2\pi i\Big(b_0a_1 + c_0a_2 + (b_1a_1 + c_1a_2)n + b_2a_1n^2 + c_3a_2n^3\Big)/q}.$$

Control of this sum is lost if $b_1a_1 + c_2a_2$, $b_2a_1$, $c_3a_2$, and $q$ all share a large common factor. While the argument allows us to control $(b_1, b_2)$, $(c_1, c_3)$, and $(a_1, a_2, q)$, this does not prohibit the aforementioned fatal scenario. While it is likely that an analog of Theorem C holds for a jointly intersective collection of polynomials, it appears that new insight is required.

## References


[1] E. Croot, I. Łaba, O. Sisask, *Arithmetic progressions in sumsets and $L^p$ almost periodicity*, Combinatorics, Probability, and Computing 22 (2013), 351-365.

[2] E. Croot, O. Sisask, *A probabilistic technique for finding almost-periods of convolutions*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 20 (2010), 1367-1396.

[3] B. Green, T. Tao, *New bounds for Szemerédi's theorem II. A new bound for $r_4(N)$,* Analytic number theory, 180-204, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.

[4] T. H. Lê, C. Spencer, *Intersective polynomials and Diophantine approximation*, Int. Math. Res. Notices (2012) doi:10.1093/imrn/rns242.

[5] J. Lucier, *Intersective Sets Given by a Polynomial*, Acta Arith. 123 (2006), 57-95.

[6] N. Lyall, À. Magyar, *Simultaneous polynomial recurrence*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 43 (2011), no. 4, 765-785.

[7] A. Rice, *Improvements and extensions of two theorems of Sárközy*, Ph. D. thesis, University of Georgia, 2012. http://alexricemath.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/AlexThesis.pdf.

[8] T. Sanders, *On the Bogolyubov-Ruzsa lemma*, Anal. PDE 5 (2012), no. 3, 627-655.

[9] W. M. Schmidt, *Small fractional parts of polynomials*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Math., **32**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1977.

[10] R. C. Vaughan, *The Hardy-Littlewood method*, Cambridge University Press, Second Edition, 1997.



Department of Mathematics, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

*E-mail address*: lyall@math.uga.edu

Department of Mathematics, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA 17837, USA

*E-mail address*: alex.rice@bucknell.edu